



12-09-03

Image

AF

\$

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PTO/SB/17 (10-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004 <small>Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.</small>		Complete if Known	
		Application Number	09/736,548
		Filing Date	13 December 2000
		First Named Inventor	Schumann
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27		Examiner Name	Victor S. Chang
		Art Unit	1771
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) \$330.00		Attorney Docket No.	tesa AG 685/ 101769-90

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)		FEE CALCULATION (continued)																																																																																																																																																																																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Check <input type="checkbox"/> Credit card <input type="checkbox"/> Money Order <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> None		3. ADDITIONAL FEES																																																																																																																																																																																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deposit Account: Deposit Account Number: 14-1263 Deposit Account Name: Norris, McLaughlin & Marcus		<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Large Entity</th><th>Small Entity</th><th>Fee Code</th><th>Fee (\$)</th><th>Fee Description</th><th>Fee Paid</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1051</td><td>130</td><td>2051 65 Surcharge - late filing fee or oath</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1052</td><td>50</td><td>2052 25 Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1053</td><td>130</td><td>1053 130 Non - English specification</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1812</td><td>2,520</td><td>1812 2,520 For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1804</td><td>920*</td><td>1804 920* Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1805</td><td>1,840*</td><td>1805 1,840* Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1251</td><td>110</td><td>2251 55 Extension for reply within first month</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1252</td><td>420</td><td>2252 210 Extension for reply within second month</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1253</td><td>950</td><td>2253 475 Extension for reply within third month</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1254</td><td>1,480</td><td>2254 740 Extension for reply within fourth month</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1255</td><td>2,010</td><td>2255 1,005 Extension for reply within fifth month</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1401</td><td>330</td><td>2401 165 Notice of Appeal</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1402</td><td>330</td><td>2402 165 Filing a brief in support of an appeal</td><td>330.00</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1403</td><td>290</td><td>2403 145 Request for oral hearing</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1451</td><td>1,510</td><td>1451 1,510 Petition to institute a public use proceeding</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1452</td><td>110</td><td>2452 55 Petition to revive - unavoidable</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1453</td><td>1,330</td><td>2453 665 Petition to revive - unintentional</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1501</td><td>1,330</td><td>2501 665 Utility issue fee (or reissue)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1502</td><td>480</td><td>2502 240 Design issue fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1503</td><td>640</td><td>2503 320 Plant issue fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1460</td><td>130</td><td>1460 130 Petitions to the Commissioner</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1807</td><td>50</td><td>1807 50 Processing fee under 37 CFR § 1.17(q)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1806</td><td>180</td><td>1806 180 Submission of Information Disclosure Statement</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>8021</td><td>40</td><td>8021 40 Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1809</td><td>770</td><td>2809 385 Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1810</td><td>770</td><td>2810 385 For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1801</td><td>770</td><td>2801 385 Request for Continued Examination (RCE)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1802</td><td>900</td><td>1802 900 Request for expedited examination of a design application</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td colspan="4">Other fee (specify) _____</td></tr></tbody></table>		Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid			1051	130	2051 65 Surcharge - late filing fee or oath				1052	50	2052 25 Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet				1053	130	1053 130 Non - English specification				1812	2,520	1812 2,520 For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination				1804	920*	1804 920* Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action				1805	1,840*	1805 1,840* Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action				1251	110	2251 55 Extension for reply within first month				1252	420	2252 210 Extension for reply within second month				1253	950	2253 475 Extension for reply within third month				1254	1,480	2254 740 Extension for reply within fourth month				1255	2,010	2255 1,005 Extension for reply within fifth month				1401	330	2401 165 Notice of Appeal				1402	330	2402 165 Filing a brief in support of an appeal	330.00			1403	290	2403 145 Request for oral hearing				1451	1,510	1451 1,510 Petition to institute a public use proceeding				1452	110	2452 55 Petition to revive - unavoidable				1453	1,330	2453 665 Petition to revive - unintentional				1501	1,330	2501 665 Utility issue fee (or reissue)				1502	480	2502 240 Design issue fee				1503	640	2503 320 Plant issue fee				1460	130	1460 130 Petitions to the Commissioner				1807	50	1807 50 Processing fee under 37 CFR § 1.17(q)				1806	180	1806 180 Submission of Information Disclosure Statement				8021	40	8021 40 Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)				1809	770	2809 385 Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))				1810	770	2810 385 For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))				1801	770	2801 385 Request for Continued Examination (RCE)				1802	900	1802 900 Request for expedited examination of a design application				Other fee (specify) _____			
Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																																		
		1051	130	2051 65 Surcharge - late filing fee or oath																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1052	50	2052 25 Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1053	130	1053 130 Non - English specification																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1812	2,520	1812 2,520 For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1804	920*	1804 920* Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1805	1,840*	1805 1,840* Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1251	110	2251 55 Extension for reply within first month																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1252	420	2252 210 Extension for reply within second month																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1253	950	2253 475 Extension for reply within third month																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1254	1,480	2254 740 Extension for reply within fourth month																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1255	2,010	2255 1,005 Extension for reply within fifth month																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1401	330	2401 165 Notice of Appeal																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1402	330	2402 165 Filing a brief in support of an appeal	330.00																																																																																																																																																																																		
		1403	290	2403 145 Request for oral hearing																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1451	1,510	1451 1,510 Petition to institute a public use proceeding																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1452	110	2452 55 Petition to revive - unavoidable																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1453	1,330	2453 665 Petition to revive - unintentional																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1501	1,330	2501 665 Utility issue fee (or reissue)																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1502	480	2502 240 Design issue fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1503	640	2503 320 Plant issue fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1460	130	1460 130 Petitions to the Commissioner																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1807	50	1807 50 Processing fee under 37 CFR § 1.17(q)																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1806	180	1806 180 Submission of Information Disclosure Statement																																																																																																																																																																																			
		8021	40	8021 40 Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1809	770	2809 385 Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1810	770	2810 385 For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1801	770	2801 385 Request for Continued Examination (RCE)																																																																																																																																																																																			
		1802	900	1802 900 Request for expedited examination of a design application																																																																																																																																																																																			
		Other fee (specify) _____																																																																																																																																																																																					
1. BASIC FILING FEE <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Large Entity</th><th>Small Entity</th><th>Fee Code</th><th>Fee (\$)</th><th>Fee Description</th><th>Fee Paid</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1001</td><td>2001</td><td>770</td><td>385</td><td>Utility filing fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1002</td><td>2002</td><td>340</td><td>170</td><td>Design filing fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1003</td><td>2003</td><td>530</td><td>265</td><td>Plant filing fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1004</td><td>2004</td><td>770</td><td>385</td><td>Reissue filing fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1005</td><td>2005</td><td>160</td><td>80</td><td>Provisional filing fee</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="5">SUBTOTAL (1)</td><td>(\$)</td></tr></tbody></table>		Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid	1001	2001	770	385	Utility filing fee		1002	2002	340	170	Design filing fee		1003	2003	530	265	Plant filing fee		1004	2004	770	385	Reissue filing fee		1005	2005	160	80	Provisional filing fee		SUBTOTAL (1)					(\$)																																																																																																																																												
Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																																		
1001	2001	770	385	Utility filing fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
1002	2002	340	170	Design filing fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
1003	2003	530	265	Plant filing fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
1004	2004	770	385	Reissue filing fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
1005	2005	160	80	Provisional filing fee																																																																																																																																																																																			
SUBTOTAL (1)					(\$)																																																																																																																																																																																		
2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND <table border="1"><thead><tr><th colspan="2">Extra Claims</th><th>Fee from below</th><th>Fee Paid</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Total Claims</td><td>-20** = 0</td><td>X</td><td>0.00</td></tr><tr><td>Independent Claims</td><td>-3** = 0</td><td>X</td><td>0.00</td></tr><tr><td>Multiple Dependent</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Large Entity</th><th>Small Entity</th><th>Fee Code</th><th>Fee (\$)</th><th>Fee Description</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1202</td><td>2202</td><td>18</td><td>9</td><td>Claims in excess of 20</td></tr><tr><td>1201</td><td>2201</td><td>86</td><td>43</td><td>Independent claims in excess of 3</td></tr><tr><td>1203</td><td>2203</td><td>290</td><td>145</td><td>Multiple dependent claim, if not paid</td></tr><tr><td>1204</td><td>2204</td><td>86</td><td>43</td><td>** Reissue independent claims over original patent</td></tr><tr><td>1205</td><td>2205</td><td>18</td><td>9</td><td>** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">SUBTOTAL (2)</td><td>(\$) \$0.00</td></tr></tbody></table>		Extra Claims		Fee from below	Fee Paid	Total Claims	-20** = 0	X	0.00	Independent Claims	-3** = 0	X	0.00	Multiple Dependent				Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	1202	2202	18	9	Claims in excess of 20	1201	2201	86	43	Independent claims in excess of 3	1203	2203	290	145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	1204	2204	86	43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent	1205	2205	18	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent	SUBTOTAL (2)				(\$) \$0.00																																																																																																																																			
Extra Claims		Fee from below	Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																																				
Total Claims	-20** = 0	X	0.00																																																																																																																																																																																				
Independent Claims	-3** = 0	X	0.00																																																																																																																																																																																				
Multiple Dependent																																																																																																																																																																																							
Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description																																																																																																																																																																																			
1202	2202	18	9	Claims in excess of 20																																																																																																																																																																																			
1201	2201	86	43	Independent claims in excess of 3																																																																																																																																																																																			
1203	2203	290	145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid																																																																																																																																																																																			
1204	2204	86	43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent																																																																																																																																																																																			
1205	2205	18	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent																																																																																																																																																																																			
SUBTOTAL (2)				(\$) \$0.00																																																																																																																																																																																			
**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above		*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																																					
		SUBTOTAL (3) (\$)																																																																																																																																																																																					
		330.00																																																																																																																																																																																					

SUBMITTED BY		Complete (if applicable)	
Name (Print/Type)	Howard C. Lee	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	48,104
Signature	Howard C. Lee	Telephone	212-808-0700
		Date	8 December 2003

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



tesa AG 685-HCL
101769-90
3162-St-sti

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

APPLICANTS : SCHÜMANN et al.
SERIAL NO. : 09/736,548
FILED : 13 December 2000
FOR : ADHESIVE TAPE, IN PARTICULAR FOR MAKING A CATHODIC
ELECTROCOAT PRIMER
ART UNIT : 1771
EXAMINER : Victor S. Chang

8 December 2003

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents
Hon. Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 1.192

SIR:

This is an appeal from the final rejection dated 26 December 2002.

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is **tesa AG** which is a subsidiary of Beiersdorf AG. Beiersdorf AG received a Notice of Recordation of Assignment on at Reel 011396, Frame 0717 (Recorded on 13 December 2000).

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals and interferences.

12/11/2003 DTESSEM1 00000050 141263 09736548

01 FC:1402 330.00 DA

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS - SUMMARY OF PROSECUTION HISTORY

Claims 1 and 4-11 stand rejected.

Action number from PAIR	Content Description	Comments
38 (12/8/2003)	Appeal Brief #2	This paper
37 (12/3/2003)	Mail Advisory Action	Have not yet received advisory action as of this date but presumed to indicate that claims are not allowed. Had previously requested examiner telephone the applicants' representative if allowable subject matter were found and no call had been received to date.
32 (10/8/2003)	Amendment After Final Rej. Notice of Appeal	(see comment on page 2 of Amendment After Final Rej. - "Waiver of Petition of Finality of Rejection")
30 (7/8/2003)	Mail Final Rejection	
27 (5/27/2003)	Appeal Brief #1	
25 (4/4/2003)	Mail Advisory Action	
23 (3/26/2003)	Amendment After Final Rej. Notice of Appeal	
18 (12/13/2002)	Final rejection	
16 (11/27/2002)	Response to Non-Final Action	
13 (5/29/2002)	Non-final Rejection	
1 (12/13/2000)	Initial Exam Team In (Filing Date)	3-year clock for PTA starts on 12/13/2003 Prosecution PTA stands at +15 days

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

It appears that all amendments have been entered. The After-Final response dated 26 March 2003 included an amendment to the specification which was stated to be entered in the Advisory Action dated 4 April 2003 (Paper No. 13). No amendments were made to the claims in the After-Final response.

(5) SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention as represented by claim 1 relates to an adhesive tape provided on one side with a self-adhesive composition and comprising a backing material comprising a polyester film coated with a crosslinked epoxy resin, wherein:

- the crosslinked epoxy resin is prepared using epoxy resins selected from the group consisting of liquid, solvent-free epoxy resins based on bisphenol A, bisphenol F or bisphenol A/F; reactively diluted or plasticized epoxy resins; polyfunctional novolak glycidyl ether resins; aliphatic or cycloaliphatic epoxy resins; and mixtures of said epoxy resins;

and wherein

- said epoxy resins are cured using a curing agent selected from the group consisting of formulated polyethers/polyamines; nonformulated aliphatic polyamines; araliphatic polyamines; cycloaliphatic polyamines; aromatic amine curing agents; modified polyamines; polyamidoamines; polyaminoimidazoline; polyether amines; and formulated adducts or mixtures of said amines.

Support for this invention can be found, for example, on page 21 (originally filed claims 1-3)

Support for the subject matter of claims 4-10 can be found, for example on page 21 (originally filed claims 4-10). Claim 11 reintroduces the deleted "particular preference" ranges of originally filed claim 4.

(6) ISSUES

The lone remaining issue is whether claims 1 and 4-11 are obvious or non-obvious in light of Kinzer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,667,893) alone or in view of Wiest et al. (U.S. Patent 4,322,516) as applied to claims 6 and 11. (Sobel (U.S. Patent 3,609,190) is presented as evidence by the examiner that some amines may be hardeners)

(7) GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For the purpose of this Appeal Brief, the claims will be divided into three groups:

- (1) Claims 1, 4-7 and 11 are directed toward an adhesive tape with claims 1, 4 and 5 standing of falling together; claim 7 will be argued separately. Claims 6 and 11 will also be argued separately.
- (2) Claim 8 is directed toward a method of masking window flanges.
- (3) Claims 9 and 10 are directed toward a process of making the adhesive tape of claim 1.

(8) ARGUMENT

Summary of Arguments

- (a) Kinzer does not teach an epoxy component AND an amine component as part of the crosslinked epoxy resin.
- (b) Kinzer only describes the related art as teaching the use of crosslinked structures. However, there is no evidence that Kinzer's product itself is crosslinked.
- (c) No reasonable expectation of success for modification to Kinzer given the other elements of their invention.
- (d) Kinzer does not teach the limitation of claim 7.
- (e) Kinzer does not teach the method of using (claim 8) or the process of making (claims 9 and 10) the adhesive tape of claim 1.
- (f) Kinzer in view of Wiest does not teach the adhesive tape compositions with the self-adhesive compositions of claims 6 and 11.

Restatement of the Facts

The essential elements of the appellant's broadest claim (claim 1) is compared with the "Summary of the Invention" of Kinzer is represented in the table below (see next page):

Appellants' claim 1	Kinzer "Summary of the Invention" (paraphrased)
An adhesive tape provided on one side with a self-adhesive composition	An article (flexible tape backing or a chip resistant paint)
and comprising a backing material comprising a polyester film coated with a crosslinked epoxy resin , wherein	comprising a substrate coated with a flexible epoxy composition
the crosslinked epoxy resin is prepared using epoxy resins selected from the group consisting of liquid, solvent-free epoxy resins based on bisphenol A, bisphenol F or bisphenol A/F; reactively diluted or plasticized epoxy resins; polyfunctional novolak glycidyl ether resins; aliphatic or cycloaliphatic epoxy resins; and mixtures of said epoxy resins;	wherein the photopolymerizable epoxy composition comprises: (a) a plurality of epoxides including at least one selected from the group consisting of cycloaliphatic epoxides and bisphenol A epoxide,
and wherein said epoxy resins are cured using a curing agent selected from the group consisting of formulated polyethers/polyamines; nonformulated aliphatic polyamines; araliphatic polyamines; cycloaliphatic polyamines; aromatic amine curing agents; modified polyamines; polyamidoamines; polyaminoimidazoline; polyether amines; and formulated adducts or mixtures of said amines.	
	and at least one different aliphatic epoxide,
	(b) from about 0.1 to about 2% of at least one organometallic cationic initiator capable of initiating polymerization at wavelengths of from 200 to about 600 nm, and
	(c) optionally, at least one accelerating agent,

Viewing Kinzer in a light most favorable to the examiner's position, it can be argued that the appellants limitations represented in appellants' claim 4 and 5 are possible additional elements for Kinzer's invention. However, the most glaring difference between the appellants' invention and that of Kinzer is the lack of an explicit recitation for the use of an amine.

Arguments in favor of non-obviousness

- (a) Kinzer does not teach an epoxy component AND an amine component as part of the crosslinked epoxy resin.

MPEP 2143.03 states that "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." (see also *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d

981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)). However, the examiner's reliance on Kinzer alone to reject appellants' claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-10 does not adequately consider the Kinzer reference "as a whole" as is required by the four tenets of patent law for applying 35 U.S.C. 103 as outlined in MPEP 2141 (page 2100-143, Feb. 2003 rev.)

The examiner had previously stated in his Advisory Action (Paper No. 13) that Kinzer "...may also include hardeners (i.e. amines), etc. (column 6, lines 17-21)." However, the appellants believe this interpretation fails to consider the teachings of Kinzer "as a whole".

The characterization of hardeners as being equivalent to amines comes from the examiner *not* from the teachings of Kinzer. Furthermore, the recitation of hardeners is within a Markush-like grouping of optional adjuvants (col. 6, lines 17-21 from Kinzer is reproduced below):

Compositions of the invention may also include optional adjuvants such as co-curatives, hardeners, fillers, plasticizers, pigments, antioxidants, surface modifying agents, and the like, in amounts such that they do not interfere with the photopolymerization of the epoxides.

It has long been held that "[i]t is impermissible within the framework of section 103 to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art." (see *In re Wesslau*, 353 F.2d 238, 241, 147 USPQ 391, 393 (CCPA 1965)). This concept has been more recently been affirmed in *ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*, 159 F.3d 534, 546, 48 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 1998):

"Determination of obviousness cannot be based on the hindsight combination of components selectively culled from the prior art to fit the parameters of the patented invention; rather, there must be a teaching or suggestion within the prior art, or within the general knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention, to look to particular sources of information, to select particular elements, and to combine them in the way they were combined by the inventor. See *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 665, 57 USPQ2d 1161, 1167 (Fed.Cir.2000); *ATD Corp.*, 159 F.3d at 546, 48 USPQ2d at 1329; *Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.*, 21 F.3d 1068, 1072, 30 USPQ2d 1377, 1379 (Fed.Cir.1994) ("When the patented invention is made by combining known components to achieve a new system, the prior art must provide a suggestion or motivation to make such a combination."); *Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp.*, 908 F.2d 931, 935, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1324 (Fed.Cir.1990) (the prior art must suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the desirability of the claimed composition); *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 U.S.P.Q. 543, 551 (Fed.Cir.1985)."

For the present situation, Kinzer does not teach or suggest that one of ordinary skill practice and of the following:

- (1) that the adjuvants are required elements which must be part of Kinzer's invention;
- (2) that hardeners are preferably selected from the Markush group of adjuvants; and
- (3) the hardener must be an amine.

(The Sobel reference is of little value in remedying any deficiencies with regard to Kinzer as it only serves to indicate that some amines can be hardeners; there is no recitation that all amines are equivalent to hardeners, merely those taught by Sobel are hardeners.

Any argument that it should be permissible to "pick and choose" elements from within the teaching of Kinzer would be counteracted by the sheer volume of possible embodiments should such a standard be allowed. The court of *In re Rice*, 178 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1973) held that, "...the board said, referring to the appellant's ingredients, 'It should be noted that an infinite number of combinations is possible.' Accepting that as an approximation to the truth, we fail to see the obviousness in devising appellant's.....[invention] as claimed." *Id.* at 480. The list of optional ingredients which could be added if taking the suggestion from col. 6, lines 17-21 of Kinzer seriously would result in a virtually infinite number of permutations of the invention of Kinzer. Not only is there no direction as to which adjuvant one to select, there is no teaching for selecting a particular species of that adjuvant (i.e. amines) and therefore combination of an amine with the teachings of Kinzer is unobvious.

- (b) Kinzer only describes the related art as teaching the use of crosslinked structures. However, there is no evidence that Kinzer's product itself is crosslinked.**

Even if *in arguendo* there was some rationale to "pick and choose" an amine in the teachings of Kinzer, there is nothing within the Kinzer reference which teaches or suggests a crosslinked epoxy resin as in the appellants' invention.

If the examiner had been relying on inherency to establish that Kinzer et al. teaches a crosslinked epoxy resin via the use of an amine, no recitation of facts were acknowledged in support of such a position.

MPEP 2112 (Requirements of Rejection Based on Inherency; Burden of Proof) states "*The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not*

sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)...To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. *Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.*' *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999), see also *Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Medical Device Alliance, Inc. (Mentor II)*, 244 F.3d 1365, 58 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2001) and *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981).

In the present situation, not only is there no factual basis for establishing that Kinzer teaches or is inherently a crosslinked product, there are indications from within Kinzer's own specification that it is not:

- (1) the discussion in Kinzer's "Description of the Related Art" speaks to polymerized, crosslinked structures but also to the problems associated with them which suggests that Kinzer's invention is directed away from the prior art methods. Furthermore, when given the opportunity to describe his own invention, Kinzer distinctly refuses to characterize his invention as a crosslinked polymer;
 - (2) Kinzer appears to teach away from their intended epoxy composition being crosslinked as it is described in their Summary of the Invention that "...the present invention provides an article comprising a substrate coated with a **flexible** epoxy composition" or "**photopolymerizable**" epoxy composition.
- (c) **No reasonable expectation of success for modification to Kinzer given the other elements of their invention.**

The ultimate determination whether an invention would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is a legal conclusion based on underlying findings of fact (see *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1369, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2000)).

However, given the additional components which are required by Kinzer et al.'s epoxy composition (i.e. "at least one organometallic cationic initiator") and other optional ingredients

thereof ("optionally, at least one accelerating agent" (i.e. peroxides) - see col. 5, line 64 - col. 6, line 3 of Kinzer) and that even in Kinzer's broad recitation of the use of "hardeners" there is included the caveat that such additions are made "in amounts not to interfere with the photopolymerization of the epoxides", there has been no factual basis established for a reasonable expectation of success to add amines to the invention of Kinzer as indicated by the examiner.

MPEP 2143.01 states "If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)." Kinzer's claimed invention is directed toward "an article comprising a substrate which has coated thereon a **photopolymerizable** epoxy composition". There is no indication that Kinzer also contemplates crosslinked epoxy resins as in the appellants' claimed invention. Kinzer defines "photopolymerization" in col. 3, lines 31-35:

1. The term "photopolymerizable" means that a compound or composition is capable of polymerizing (i.e., being fully cured) when irradiated preferably by ultra-violet emissions in the range of from about 180 nm to about 420 nm.

As such, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to select an amine component within the context of Kinzer's invention as this would produce a different epoxy composition than that contemplated by Kinzer.

(d) Kinzer does not teach the limitation of claim 7.

MPEP 2143.03 states that "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." As Kinzer is primarily preoccupied with their photopolymerizable epoxy compositions, scant attention is paid to their self-adhesive compositions and nowhere is there a recitation that their self-adhesive composition has a thickness of from 15 to 40 μm .

- (e) Kinzer does not teach the method of using (claim 8) or the process of making (claims 9 and 10) the adhesive tape of claim 1.**

The primary thrust of the examiner's rejection had been against independent claim 1. However, it has never been adequately explained how the Kinzer reference renders the method of use claim or the product of making claim to be obvious as the reference to the adhesive tape and its uses was only made in passing in the Kinzer reference; most of the energies in Kinzer was directed toward the epoxy composition.

- (f) Kinzer in view of Wiest does not teach the adhesive tape compositions with the self adhesive compositions of claims 6 and 11.**

Should the rejection of Kinzer be reversed this rejection would also be reversed. However, further arguments against the combination of Kinzer in view of Wiest are made below in the event that the rejection based on Kinzer is affirmed.

Wiest describes a copolymer which has ranges for the amount of ethylene, vinyl acetate, acrylic acid and methacrylamide which overlaps that of the appellants' claims (presuming that there is equivalence for methacrylamide (Wiest) and acrylamide (appellants)). However, what is lacking is any motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings which come from the references themselves or from the known state of the art. The examiner's explanation appears to be based on hindsight reconstruction (i.e. presumes that the skilled artisan would have had a copy of the appellants' claims before him when considering the scope of the inventions represented by Kinzer and Wiest). This is not permissible according to MPEP 2142.

Going back in time to the filing date of the applicants claimed invention without the benefit of the appellants claims, one of ordinary skill in the art would already have to have made the remarkable selection of an amine despite the infinite number of additional adjuvants which could be selected and lack of knowledge of the success of using an amine and would then proceed to again pick among the infinite number of copolymers available to select the one described by Wiest. Such a presumption strains credulity and therefore, such a combination would not render the appellants' claimed invention to be obvious.

(9) CONCLUSION

For any of the foregoing reasons, Appellants respectfully request that the Honorable Board reverse the final rejection of claims 1 and 4-11.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess to our Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By *Howard C. Lee*
Howard C. Lee
Reg. No. 48,104

220 E. 42nd Street
30th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(212) 808-0700

tesa AG 685-HCL
101769-90
3162-St-sti

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
via Express Mail, Label No. EV 383031580 US
to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on
8 December , 2003.

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By Agata Glinzka

Agata Glinzka

Date 8 December, 2003

(10) APPENDIX - CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. An adhesive tape provided on one side with a self-adhesive composition and comprising a backing material comprising a polyester film coated with a crosslinked epoxy resin, wherein

the crosslinked epoxy resin is prepared using epoxy resins selected from the group consisting of liquid, solvent-free epoxy resins based on bisphenol A, bisphenol F or bisphenol A/F; reactively diluted or plasticized epoxy resins; polyfunctional novolak glycidyl ether resins; aliphatic or cycloaliphatic epoxy resins; and mixtures of said epoxy resins;

and wherein said epoxy resins are cured using a curing agent selected from the group consisting of formulated polyethers/polyamines; nonformulated aliphatic polyamines; araliphatic polyamines; cycloaliphatic polyamines; aromatic amine curing agents; modified polyamines; polyamidoamines; polyaminoimidazoline; polyether amines; and formulated adducts or mixtures of said amines.
4. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein the crosslinked epoxy resin comprises fillers, plasticizers and, optionally, auxiliaries and additives as further formulating constituents.
5. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein on the reverse of the crosslinked epoxy resin there is a release coating.
6. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein the self-adhesive composition has the following makeup:

ethylene	from 10 to 30% by weight
vinyl acetate	from 20 to 55% by weight
acrylic ester	from 30 to 69% by weight
acrylamide	from 0 to 8% by weight.
7. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein the self-adhesive composition has a thickness of from 15 to 40 μm .
8. A method for masking window flanges which comprises applying the tape of Claim 1 to said flanges.

9. A process for producing the adhesive tape of claim 1, which comprises applying a mixture of starting components of the epoxy resin during their chemical reaction phase directly on the polyester film.
10. The process of claim 9, wherein the polyester film is provided with the self-adhesive composition prior to coating with the crosslinked epoxy resin opposite the side to be coated with epoxy resin.
11. The adhesive tape of Claim 6, wherein
 - the amount of ethylene is 10 to 15% by weight,
 - the amount of vinyl acetate is 30 to 35% by weight,
 - the amount of acrylic ester is 50 to 60% by weight,
 - the amount of acrylamide is 0.5% by weight.



tesa AG 685-HCL
101769-90
3162-St-sti

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

APPLICANTS : SCHÜMANN et al.
SERIAL NO. : 09/736,548
FILED : 13 December 2000
FOR : ADHESIVE TAPE, IN PARTICULAR FOR MAKING A CATHODIC
ELECTROCOAT PRIMER
ART UNIT : 1771
EXAMINER : Victor S. Chang

8 December 2003

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents
Hon. Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 1.192

SIR:

This is an appeal from the final rejection dated 26 December 2002.

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is **tesa AG** which is a subsidiary of Beiersdorf AG. Beiersdorf AG received a Notice of Recordation of Assignment on at Reel 011396, Frame 0717 (Recorded on 13 December 2000).

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals and interferences.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS - SUMMARY OF PROSECUTION HISTORY

Claims 1 and 4-11 stand rejected.

Action number from PAIR	Content Description	Comments
38 (12/8/2003)	Appeal Brief #2	This paper
37 (12/3/2003)	Mail Advisory Action	Have not yet received advisory action as of this date but presumed to indicate that claims are not allowed. Had previously requested examiner telephone the applicants' representative if allowable subject matter were found and no call had been received to date.
32 (10/8/2003)	Amendment After Final Rej. Notice of Appeal	(see comment on page 2 of Amendment After Final Rej. - "Waiver of Petition of Finality of Rejection")
30 (7/8/2003)	Mail Final Rejection	
27 (5/27/2003)	Appeal Brief #1	
25 (4/4/2003)	Mail Advisory Action	
23 (3/26/2003)	Amendment After Final Rej. Notice of Appeal	
18 (12/13/2002)	Final rejection	
16 (11/27/2002)	Response to Non-Final Action	
13 (5/29/2002)	Non-final Rejection	
1 (12/13/2000)	Initial Exam Team In (Filing Date)	3-year clock for PTA starts on 12/13/2003 Prosecution PTA stands at +15 days

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

It appears that all amendments have been entered. The After-Final response dated 26 March 2003 included an amendment to the specification which was stated to be entered in the Advisory Action dated 4 April 2003 (Paper No. 13). No amendments were made to the claims in the After-Final response.

(5) SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention as represented by claim 1 relates to an adhesive tape provided on one side with a self-adhesive composition and comprising a backing material comprising a polyester film coated with a crosslinked epoxy resin, wherein:

- the crosslinked epoxy resin is prepared using epoxy resins selected from the group consisting of liquid, solvent-free epoxy resins based on bisphenol A, bisphenol F or bisphenol A/F; reactively diluted or plasticized epoxy resins; polyfunctional novolak glycidyl ether resins; aliphatic or cycloaliphatic epoxy resins; and mixtures of said epoxy resins;

and wherein

- said epoxy resins are cured using a curing agent selected from the group consisting of formulated polyethers/polyamines; nonformulated aliphatic polyamines; aliphatic polyamines; cycloaliphatic polyamines; aromatic amine curing agents; modified polyamines; polyamidoamines; polyaminoimidazoline; polyether amines; and formulated adducts or mixtures of said amines.

Support for this invention can be found, for example, on page 21 (originally filed claims 1-3)

Support for the subject matter of claims 4-10 can be found, for example on page 21 (originally filed claims 4-10). Claim 11 reintroduces the deleted "particular preference" ranges of originally filed claim 4.

(6) ISSUES

The lone remaining issue is whether claims 1 and 4-11 are obvious or non-obvious in light of Kinzer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,667,893) alone or in view of Wiest et al. (U.S. Patent 4,322,516) as applied to claims 6 and 11. (Sobel (U.S. Patent 3,609,190) is presented as evidence by the examiner that some amines may be hardeners)

(7) GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For the purpose of this Appeal Brief, the claims will be divided into three groups:

- (1) Claims 1, 4-7 and 11 are directed toward an adhesive tape with claims 1, 4 and 5 standing of falling together; claim 7 will be argued separately. Claims 6 and 11 will also be argued separately.
- (2) Claim 8 is directed toward a method of masking window flanges.
- (3) Claims 9 and 10 are directed toward a process of making the adhesive tape of claim 1.

(8) ARGUMENT

Summary of Arguments

- (a) Kinzer does not teach an epoxy component AND an amine component as part of the crosslinked epoxy resin.
- (b) Kinzer only describes the related art as teaching the use of crosslinked structures. However, there is no evidence that Kinzer's product itself is crosslinked.
- (c) No reasonable expectation of success for modification to Kinzer given the other elements of their invention.
- (d) Kinzer does not teach the limitation of claim 7.
- (e) Kinzer does not teach the method of using (claim 8) or the process of making (claims 9 and 10) the adhesive tape of claim 1.
- (f) Kinzer in view of Wiest does not teach the adhesive tape compositions with the self-adhesive compositions of claims 6 and 11.

Restatement of the Facts

The essential elements of the appellant's broadest claim (claim 1) is compared with the "Summary of the Invention" of Kinzer is represented in the table below (see next page):

Appellants' claim 1	Kinzer "Summary of the Invention" (paraphrased)
An adhesive tape provided on one side with a self-adhesive composition	An article (flexible tape backing or a chip resistant paint)
and comprising a backing material comprising a polyester film coated with a crosslinked epoxy resin , wherein	comprising a substrate coated with a flexible epoxy composition
the crosslinked epoxy resin is prepared using epoxy resins selected from the group consisting of liquid, solvent-free epoxy resins based on bisphenol A, bisphenol F or bisphenol A/F; reactively diluted or plasticized epoxy resins; polyfunctional novolak glycidyl ether resins; aliphatic or cycloaliphatic epoxy resins; and mixtures of said epoxy resins;	wherein the photopolymerizable epoxy composition comprises: (a) a plurality of epoxides including at least one selected from the group consisting of cycloaliphatic epoxides and bisphenol A epoxide,
and wherein said epoxy resins are cured using a curing agent selected from the group consisting of formulated polyethers/polyamines; nonformulated aliphatic polyamines; alicyclic polyamines; cycloaliphatic polyamines; aromatic amine curing agents; modified polyamines; polyamidoamines; polyaminoimidazoline; polyether amines; and formulated adducts or mixtures of said amines.	
	and at least one different aliphatic epoxide,
	(b) from about 0.1 to about 2% of at least one organometallic cationic initiator capable of initiating polymerization at wavelengths of from 200 to about 600 nm, and
	(c) optionally, at least one accelerating agent,

Viewing Kinzer in a light most favorable to the examiner's position, it can be argued that the appellants' limitations represented in appellants' claim 4 and 5 are possible additional elements for Kinzer's invention. However, the most glaring difference between the appellants' invention and that of Kinzer is the lack of an explicit recitation for the use of an amine.

Arguments in favor of non-obviousness

- (a) Kinzer does not teach an epoxy component AND an amine component as part of the crosslinked epoxy resin.

MPEP 2143.03 states that "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." (see also *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d

981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)). However, the examiner's reliance on Kinzer alone to reject appellants' claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-10 does not adequately consider the Kinzer reference "as a whole" as is required by the four tenets of patent law for applying 35 U.S.C. 103 as outlined in MPEP 2141 (page 2100-143, Feb. 2003 rev.)

The examiner had previously stated in his Advisory Action (Paper No. 13) that Kinzer "...may also include hardeners (i.e. amines), etc. (column 6, lines 17-21)." However, the appellants believe this interpretation fails to consider the teachings of Kinzer "as a whole".

The characterization of hardeners as being equivalent to amines comes from the examiner *not* from the teachings of Kinzer. Furthermore, the recitation of hardeners is within a Markush-like grouping of **optional adjuvants** (col. 6, lines 17-21 from Kinzer is reproduced below):

Compositions of the invention may also include optional adjuvants such as co-curatives, hardeners, fillers, plasticizers, pigments, antioxidants, surface modifying agents, and the like, in amounts such that they do not interfere with the photopolymerization of the epoxides.

It has long been held that "[i]t is impermissible within the framework of section 103 to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art." (see *In re Wesslau*, 353 F.2d 238, 241, 147 USPQ 391, 393 (CCPA 1965)). This concept has been more recently been affirmed in *ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*, 159 F.3d 534, 546, 48 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 1998):

"Determination of obviousness cannot be based on the hindsight combination of components selectively culled from the prior art to fit the parameters of the patented invention; rather, there must be a teaching or suggestion within the prior art, or within the general knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention, to look to particular sources of information, to select particular elements, and to combine them in the way they were combined by the inventor. See *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 665, 57 USPQ2d 1161, 1167 (Fed.Cir.2000); *ATD Corp.*, 159 F.3d at 546, 48 USPQ2d at 1329; *Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.*, 21 F.3d 1068, 1072, 30 USPQ2d 1377, 1379 (Fed.Cir.1994) ("When the patented invention is made by combining known components to achieve a new system, the prior art must provide a suggestion or motivation to make such a combination."); *Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp.*, 908 F.2d 931, 935, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1324 (Fed.Cir.1990) (the prior art must suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the desirability of the claimed composition); *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 U.S.P.Q. 543, 551 (Fed.Cir.1985)."

For the present situation, Kinzer does not teach or suggest that one of ordinary skill practice and of the following:

- (1) that the adjuvants are required elements which must be part of Kinzer's invention;
- (2) that hardeners are preferably selected from the Markush group of adjuvants; and
- (3) the hardener must be an amine.

(The Sobel reference is of little value in remedying any deficiencies with regard to Kinzer as it only serves to indicate that some amines can be hardeners; there is no recitation that all amines are equivalent to hardeners, merely those taught by Sobel are hardeners.

Any argument that it should be permissible to "pick and choose" elements from within the teaching of Kinzer would be counteracted by the sheer volume of possible embodiments should such a standard be allowed. The court of *In re Rice*, 178 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1973) held that, "...the board said, referring to the appellant's ingredients, 'It should be noted that an infinite number of combinations is possible.' Accepting that as an approximation to the truth, we fail to see the obviousness in devising appellant's.....[invention] as claimed." *Id.* at 480. The list of optional ingredients which could be added if taking the suggestion from col. 6, lines 17-21 of Kinzer seriously would result in a virtually infinite number of permutations of the invention of Kinzer. Not only is there no direction as to which adjuvant one to select, there is no teaching for selecting a particular species of that adjuvant (i.e. amines) and therefore combination of an amine with the teachings of Kinzer is unobvious.

- (b) Kinzer only describes the related art as teaching the use of crosslinked structures. However, there is no evidence that Kinzer's product itself is crosslinked.**

Even if *in arguendo* there was some rationale to "pick and choose" an amine in the teachings of Kinzer, there is nothing within the Kinzer reference which teaches or suggests a crosslinked epoxy resin as in the appellants' invention.

If the examiner had been relying on inherency to establish that Kinzer et al. teaches a crosslinked epoxy resin via the use of an amine, no recitation of facts were acknowledged in support of such a position.

MPEP 2112 (Requirements of Rejection Based on Inherency; Burden of Proof) states "The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not

sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)...To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. *Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.*' *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999), see also *Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Medical Device Alliance, Inc. (Mentor II)*, 244 F.3d 1365, 58 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2001) and *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981).

In the present situation, not only is there no factual basis for establishing that Kinzer teaches or is inherently a crosslinked product, there are indications from within Kinzer's own specification that it is not:

- (1) the discussion in Kinzer's "Description of the Related Art" speaks to polymerized, crosslinked structures but also to the problems associated with them which suggests that Kinzer's invention is directed away from the prior art methods. Furthermore, when given the opportunity to describe his own invention, Kinzer distinctly refuses to characterize his invention as a crosslinked polymer;
 - (2) Kinzer appears to teach away from their intended epoxy composition being crosslinked as it is described in their Summary of the Invention that "...the present invention provides an article comprising a substrate coated with a **flexible** epoxy composition" or "**photopolymerizable**" epoxy composition.
- (c) **No reasonable expectation of success for modification to Kinzer given the other elements of their invention.**

The ultimate determination whether an invention would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is a legal conclusion based on underlying findings of fact (see *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1369, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

However, given the additional components which are required by Kinzer et al.'s epoxy composition (i.e. "at least one organometallic cationic initiator") and other optional ingredients

thereof ("optionally, at least one accelerating agent" (i.e. peroxides) - see col. 5, line 64 - col. 6, line 3 of Kinzer) and that even in Kinzer's broad recitation of the use of "hardeners" there is included the caveat that such additions are made "in amounts not to interfere with the photopolymerization of the epoxides", there has been no factual basis established for a reasonable expectation of success to add amines to the invention of Kinzer as indicated by the examiner.

MPEP 2143.01 states "If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)." Kinzer's claimed invention is directed toward "an article comprising a substrate which has coated thereon a **photopolymerizable** epoxy composition". There is no indication that Kinzer also contemplates crosslinked epoxy resins as in the appellants' claimed invention. Kinzer defines "photopolymerization" in col. 3, lines 31-35:

1. The term "photopolymerizable" means that a compound or composition is capable of polymerizing (i.e., being fully cured) when irradiated preferably by ultra-violet emissions in the range of from about 180 nm to about 420 nm.

As such, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to select an amine component within the context of Kinzer's invention as this would produce a different epoxy composition than that contemplated by Kinzer.

(d) Kinzer does not teach the limitation of claim 7.

MPEP 2143.03 states that "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." As Kinzer is primarily preoccupied with their photopolymerizable epoxy compositions, scant attention is paid to their self-adhesive compositions and nowhere is there a recitation that their self-adhesive composition has a thickness of from 15 to 40 μm .

- (e) Kinzer does not teach the method of using (claim 8) or the process of making (claims 9 and 10) the adhesive tape of claim 1.**

The primary thrust of the examiner's rejection had been against independent claim 1. However, it has never been adequately explained how the Kinzer reference renders the method of use claim or the product of making claim to be obvious as the reference to the adhesive tape and its uses was only made in passing in the Kinzer reference; most of the energies in Kinzer was directed toward the epoxy composition.

- (f) Kinzer in view of Wiest does not teach the adhesive tape compositions with the self adhesive compositions of claims 6 and 11.**

Should the rejection of Kinzer be reversed this rejection would also be reversed. However, further arguments against the combination of Kinzer in view of Wiest are made below in the event that the rejection based on Kinzer is affirmed.

Wiest describes a copolymer which has ranges for the amount of ethylene, vinyl acetate, acrylic acid and methacrylamide which overlaps that of the appellants' claims (presuming that there is equivalence for methacrylamide (Wiest) and acrylamide (appellants)). However, what is lacking is any motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings which come from the references themselves or from the known state of the art. The examiner's explanation appears to be based on hindsight reconstruction (i.e. presumes that the skilled artisan would have had a copy of the appellants' claims before him when considering the scope of the inventions represented by Kinzer and Wiest). This is not permissible according to MPEP 2142.

Going back in time to the filing date of the applicants' claimed invention without the benefit of the appellants' claims, one of ordinary skill in the art would already have to have made the remarkable selection of an amine despite the infinite number of additional adjuvants which could be selected and lack of knowledge of the success of using an amine and would then proceed to again pick among the infinite number of copolymers available to select the one described by Wiest. Such a presumption strains credulity and therefore, such a combination would not render the appellants' claimed invention to be obvious.

(9) CONCLUSION

For any of the foregoing reasons, Appellants respectfully request that the Honorable Board reverse the final rejection of claims 1 and 4-11.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess to our Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By *Howard C. Lee*
Howard C. Lee
Reg. No. 48,104

220 E. 42nd Street
30th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(212) 808-0700

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
via Express Mail, Label No. EV 383031580 US
to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on
8 December, 2003.

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By Agata Gliniska

Agata Gliniska

Date 8 December, 2003

(10) APPENDIX - CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. An adhesive tape provided on one side with a self-adhesive composition and comprising a backing material comprising a polyester film coated with a crosslinked epoxy resin, wherein

the crosslinked epoxy resin is prepared using epoxy resins selected from the group consisting of liquid, solvent-free epoxy resins based on bisphenol A, bisphenol F or bisphenol A/F; reactively diluted or plasticized epoxy resins; polyfunctional novolak glycidyl ether resins; aliphatic or cycloaliphatic epoxy resins; and mixtures of said epoxy resins;

and wherein said epoxy resins are cured using a curing agent selected from the group consisting of formulated polyethers/polyamines; nonformulated aliphatic polyamines; araliphatic polyamines; cycloaliphatic polyamines; aromatic amine curing agents; modified polyamines; polyamidoamines; polyaminoimidazoline; polyether amines; and formulated adducts or mixtures of said amines.

4. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein the crosslinked epoxy resin comprises fillers, plasticizers and, optionally, auxiliaries and additives as further formulating constituents.
5. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein on the reverse of the crosslinked epoxy resin there is a release coating.
6. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein the self-adhesive composition has the following makeup:

ethylene	from 10 to 30% by weight
vinyl acetate	from 20 to 55% by weight
acrylic ester	from 30 to 69% by weight
acrylamide	from 0 to 8% by weight.

7. The adhesive tape according to Claim 1, wherein the self-adhesive composition has a thickness of from 15 to 40 μm .
8. A method for masking window flanges which comprises applying the tape of Claim 1 to said flanges..

9. A process for producing the adhesive tape of claim 1, which comprises applying a mixture of starting components of the epoxy resin during their chemical reaction phase directly on the polyester film.
10. The process of claim 9, wherein the polyester film is provided with the self-adhesive composition prior to coating with the crosslinked epoxy resin opposite the side to be coated with epoxy resin.
11. The adhesive tape of Claim 6, wherein
 - the amount of ethylene is 10 to 15% by weight,
 - the amount of vinyl acetate is 30 to 35% by weight,
 - the amount of acrylic ester is 50 to 60% by weight,
 - the amount of acrylamide is 0.5% by weight.